



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the case of Malthus, when the field seems so tempting, very little attempt is made to sum up the social consequences of his doctrine, although Bonar and Bagehot are quoted repeatedly. Again, the discussion of Ricardo centres around the doctrine of rent; and although his general social philosophy is hinted at on page 77, yet it is far from being adequately treated.

More interesting, because really newer, are the chapters on Cairnes, Cliffe Leslie, Bagehot, Jevons, Fawcett and Toynbee. They sum up, from a moderate point of view, the chief contributions made by these writers to economic science. Mr. Price, with courtesy and good temper, has an even word of praise for each. His comments are in the main judicious, and are less extreme than the more exaggerated, though more independent, conclusions of Professor Ingram. To the beginner and the general reader Mr. Price's little volume will be both useful and interesting.

E. R. A. S.

The Gild Merchant. A Contribution to British Municipal History. By CHARLES GROSS, Ph.D. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press, 1890. — Vol. I, 332 pp: Vol. II (Proofs and Illustrations), 447 pp.

Dr. Gross's treatise on the *Gild Merchant* is an exhilarating example of the growing internationalism in historico-economic studies. A graduate of one of the younger American universities, Mr. Gross went to Germany and took for the subject of his doctoral dissertation an obscure point in the earlier municipal history of England. He then devoted several years to the patient examination of English archives; the Oxford University Press undertook the publication of the results of his labors; and Dr. Gross has returned to America, to teach history at Harvard. But apart from this, Dr. Gross's book is significant in another way. It deals almost exclusively with the *institutional* as opposed to the economic or social side of its subject; and although such a treatment is apt to be chilling to the general reader, it is certainly the right thing just now. For what has economic or social history usually meant hitherto? It has meant either statistics about wages and prices, or picturesque details about the cut of our ancestors' clothes and the like. Such facts are very useful when we have an institutional framework to fit them into. But we want to know first what exactly were the relative numbers, the legal position, the usual duties, rights and burdens, of the various classes of the population. When we know this, we can then find a meaning for such and such a price, or such and such a local custom. Institutional history is the bony framework of economic history.

Our debt to Dr. Gross is hard to realize, because his main results

had found their way into economic writing even before the publication of his recent treatise. His conclusions as here formulated do not differ substantially from those in his German dissertation of 1883, in spite of the abundance of hitherto unprinted material which he now appends to them. Moreover, during the three or four years that the present treatise has been in the press, Dr. Gross, with self-sacrificing courtesy, has allowed copies of the proof to pass into the hands of brother-scholars, whose writings have benefited accordingly. Some of us had begun to take his main results for granted and almost to forget that Dr. Gross had never yet received the public recognition which his labors deserved. For he has done great things. He has been the first to show that the gild merchant is a characteristic feature in the early history of almost all English towns. Almost without knowing it, and with the greatest anxiety not to speak in general terms, he has forced upon us the recognition of a stage in English economic development which had before been almost entirely disregarded. That is Dr. Gross's substantial achievement; and much as it may be necessary to supplement, or even in minor matters to correct his conclusions, his name will henceforth be as indissolubly associated with the gild merchant, as that of Mr. Rogers with mediæval prices and that of Mr. Seeböhm with mediæval land-tenure. Nor is this all: he has definitely established the distinction between gild and borough, and has shown more exactly than ever before wherein the influence of the gild upon the municipal constitution really consisted. And on a score of other matters connected with his subject, he has either cast entirely new light or added greatly to the knowledge we already possessed. To mention only those which happen especially to interest the present reviewer: the "companies of merchants" of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the "common town bargains," the organization of the home staples, and above all the "affiliation" of mediæval boroughs,—are all subjects whereon Dr. Gross has rendered possible a distinct advance in our reconstruction of mediæval history.

I have however indicated above, that I hardly think even Dr. Gross has said the final word on all parts of his theme. The particular part of it which is still, to my mind, obscure, is the relation of the gild merchant to the craft gilds. That Professor Brentano has led people to think there was a "general struggle" throughout England between the gild merchant and the craft gilds is, in the eyes of Dr. Gross, one of the gravest faults of that arch-sinner. I may, perhaps, in passing, venture to put in a word of humble remonstrance against the somewhat excessive insistence on Brentano's real or imaginary faults. Granted that Brentano's essay of 1868 has abundant defects and that it has led astray most subsequent English writers, it must still be remembered that

its author was but twenty-three when he wrote it. What we have more right to be indignant about is that the study of social history should have been so dead in England that for years no one thought of going to the sources for himself. And as to craft guilds, it is not so clear after all that Brentano is entirely wrong. Suppose we strip his account of its slightly melodramatic phraseology. Suppose we recognize that the craft guilds which were organized in the fourteenth century had scarcely any "autonomy," and that when and where they did get a share in municipal government, their victory was hardly "democratic," since the guilds themselves had by that time become exclusive. Granting all this, — is there not antecedent probability, and some apparent evidence, that when the earlier craft guilds made their appearance, in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, there was a good deal of friction between them and the groups of citizens who governed the towns and monopolized their trade? It is true that the evidence refers only to the weavers, fullers and dyers; and it has been ingeniously suggested that the disabilities under which these craftsmen undoubtedly suffered in certain English towns may be explained by the supposition that they were "intruding aliens." But there is scanty ground for such an hypothesis. The more natural explanation is that collisions occurred in these particular cases because it was in the manufacture of cloth that a considerable body of artisans first came into existence. We may allow that English craftsmen were not "as a class," at any rate at first, excluded from the merchant gild or from burghal franchises (I, 109, 214); that is, that they would not be excluded *because* they were craftsmen. But the question is: Could they fulfil the conditions necessary for admission? Although neighboring landowners, or other persons living outside the town, were frequently admitted to the gild merchant, the gild was primarily an association of, or among, the burgesses of each particular place. But burgess-ship was bound up with the possession of a burgage tenement. Suppose, as might very well happen, that a weaver had no such tenement, would he be admitted? Would David the dyer, who paid a mark in the second year of King John that his messuage in Carlisle "might be a burgage" (I, 71, note 3), have been admitted to the gild merchant of Carlisle, when it was not yet a burgage? Dr. Gross indeed makes the remarkable statement that "the gildsmen were *generally* 'non feoffati'" (page 72). If he means that they did not hold land, this leads to the conclusion that they were *generally* not burgesses! For this assertion he gives three pieces of evidence. One of these, from a modern history of Lyme Regis, I am unable to consult. But of the others, one is to his own second volume, at page 13, where we find that in a list of members of the Barnstaple gild there are 92 names headed "de forinsecis non feoffatis," and 110 headed

"de intrinsecis et feoffatis." The other is to the same volume, page 236, where we are told that in Totnes every merchant in the merchant gild "non habens tenementum in Totton" must make an (additional?) annual payment of six pence, "et cum tenementum perquisierit quietus erit de predicto redditu." As burgage tenure was a condition of citizenship, so it was almost certainly, for persons who lived in the town, one of the prerequisites for membership of the gild merchant.

Another question suggests itself. Admission to the gild merchant was dependent upon the payment of certain "initiation fees." Dr. Gross charitably conjectures that the charge was proportionate to the means of the new member. But in the only clear and detailed gild rolls which he has been able to print, those of Andover (1279-1348), the usual entrance fee for one who was not the son or husband of a member was sixty shillings (II, 289-320 *passim*). Very few craftsmen at this period owned property worth one-half as much as that, to judge from the Colchester assessments printed in Dowell's *Taxation*. Elsewhere the fee may have been much lower, but a fee there was everywhere. Dr. Gross remarks that "it is necessary to emphasize the fact that craftsmen were freely admitted to the gild in the twelfth, thirteenth and fourteenth centuries" (I, 107). But the references he gives do not actually prove anything more than this, that several craftsmen are found as members in various places. This does not show that craftsmen were, *as a rule*, members. The probability is that the entrance fee, of itself, would keep most of them out.

But if we concede the probability that in some of the towns there were many craftsmen who, for one reason or another, could not get into the merchant gild, is it not also probable that they would come into conflict with the claim of its members to a monopoly of trade? Take the case of the weavers: were they to be allowed to sell their cloth to whomsoever they pleased, or only to the gild members? In one of his later Additions (I, xix), Dr. Gross allows that "on the continent the merchants seem to have oppressed the weavers and fullers because these artisans competed with them in the cloth trade," and adds: "This may help to explain similar oppressions in English towns." But here he concedes one-half of my case, and surrenders the far-fetched explanation about "alien intruders" (page 108).

As to the other half of the case, — the contention that the craftsmen in general, and those employed in the manufacture of cloth in particular, were for some time, as a matter of fact, usually devoid of burgess-rights, — this is closely bound up with the question of burgage tenure, to which I have already alluded. In any case the entry in the London *Book of Customs*, concerning the weavers and fullers of Winchester, Marlborough, Oxford and Beverley; the express declaration of the magistrates of

Lincoln, in the year 1209, that the fullers had no community (of rights) with the free citizens; and the readiness of the "cives" of London, in 1202, to bribe the King to destroy the weavers' gild,—are all facts which wait for an explanation. And in seeking for such an explanation, if continental analogy is not to be pressed, it is also not to be disregarded. When we find that there were conflicts between the crafts and the governing bodies of the towns in all the countries with which England was most closely connected; in the towns just across the Channel which belonged to the Hanse of London; in the towns of the Teutonic Hanse; in the towns of Scotland, which modelled their constitution largely on that of Newcastle, as Newcastle modelled itself on Winchester (I, 257),—is it going too far to say that the burden of proof lies upon those who maintain that the occasional references to apparently similar difficulties in England do not mean what, on the face of them, they seem to mean? The friction was certainly not so great in England, and it was earlier overcome: it was hardly altogether absent.

Without pursuing the argument further, I may send a parting shot and carry the war into Dr. Gross's camp by the remark that even so rigorous an adherent of "sources" as he is may sometimes be carried off his feet by preconceived ideas. Thus his assertions—surely important ones—that the craftsmen, even when associated in separate guilds of each occupation, still remained in the common gild merchant (I, 115), and that this common gild merchant was afterwards "resolved into" the two classes of mysteries, mercantile and artisan (page 127), are accompanied by none of those impressive notes which are wont to support his statements. They seem to approach, not distantly, those "unproved assumptions" for which Professor Brentano is so justly rebuked.

W. J. ASHLEY.

État des Habitations Ouvrières à la fin du XIXe Siècle. Étude suivie d'un Compte-rendu des Documents relatifs aux Petits Logements qui ont figuré à l'Exposition Universelle de 1889. Par ÉMILE CACHEUX. Texte et planches. Paris, Baudry, 1891.—8vo, 184 pp.

The Tenement Houses of New York City. A contribution to the study by the Tenement House Building Company. New York, 1891.—8vo, 33 pp.

The "housing of the poor" problem is daily becoming more urgent. Almost everywhere more is being done to solve it than in America. It is worth while to note the two latest contributions to the subject.

Many years ago M. Cacheux became the owner of a large number of tenement houses in one of the French cities. So deplorable did he ascertain their condition to be that he resolved to study the question à